

Date: Tue, 28 Dec 93 04:30:10 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #552  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 28 Dec 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 552

Today's Topics:

                    cb dx activity  
                    cw speed  
            License Reform -- Novice/Young Enthusiasts  
            License Restructure - Do we really need it?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Tue, 28 Dec 1993 01:12:03 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ncar!noao!coyote!cobra@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: cb dx activity  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

elendir@enst.fr () writes:

> bill nelson (billn@hpcvaac.cv.hp.com) wrote:  
>  
>       [ Re: USA Amateur Radio Exam Question pool being known in advance ]  
>  
> Well, it's hardly believable. Over here, questions are not known (The pool  
> is not published, although you may pass fake tests with questions like the  
> ones asked) nor are the answers, of course.  
> In fact, everything is done on a computer terminal.  
> A system like yours seems to me a bit... weird.

No, just archaic, as usual... :-)

Ken Thompson - cobra@coyote.datalog.com - cobra@jab.tucson.az.us

Date: Mon, 27 Dec 1993 13:35:18 GMT  
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!darwin.sura.net!perot.mtsu.edu!  
raider!theporch!jackatak!root@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: cw speed  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

```
>
> Incidentally, if the code is the thing that is holding everyone back,
> why are there so many General class hams, when they could easily take
> the Advanced level exams and upgrade without having to take a code
> test?
```

Very interesting point, Derek. Until you slapped me witht hat, I had not even considered the question... does make for interesting fodder (which will no doubt be soon shouted down as irrelevant and off the subject...) and certainly makes for a "gap" in the "code is the only barrier to upgrading" arguments.

CW copy requirements are going to be with us for a variety of reasons into the early 21st century. Maybe that isn't good, but it is how things will be. There is already substantial evidence to support change when the ITU treaty is change...it isn't going to happen before then for a variety of reasons...all of which we are going to have to live with until the time comes...

Can't we move on to something else...another more productive discussion...say of how many angels can dance on the head of a pin? ;^)

73,

Jack, W4PPT/Mobile

(1 QSL shy of 75M SSB WAS from the mobile -- and Santa doesn't go through Vermont to get to Tennessee! ;^)

```
+-----+
| Jack GF Hill          |Voice: (615) 459-2636 -           Ham Call: W4PPT |
| P. O. Box 1685        |Modem: (615) 377-5980 -   Bicycling and SCUBA Diving |
| Brentwood, TN 37024  |Fax:   (615) 459-0038 -     Life Member - ARRL |
| root@jackatak.raider.net - "Plus ca changer, plus c'est la meme chose" |
+-----+
```

-----

Date: 27 Dec 93 20:09:21 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: License Reform -- Novice/Young Enthusiasts  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>>As for young people, I tend to think that making special allowances  
>>just to get young kids into ham radio is not a good idea.

>

>Simple question: WHY do you think that?

i think it should be age-transparent as it is today. it can be a big ego  
boost to know at the age of, say, 12, you have the same rights and  
responsibilities as those 4x your age.

amateur radio IS. those wanting a license may get one. i sure don't want to  
see "generation X vs. the old fogeys" here too. all ages, all the same.

there are too many things "dumbed down" for kids today as it is. (went to see  
"Batman:TAM" sunday...there were some surprised parents who must have  
seriously thought they were going to see Adam West and Burt Ward again - yes,  
it's animation, but it's a "people die" animation style instead of the Smurfs  
vs. Big Puppy...) I love to pick on bumper bowling since it delays learning  
that putting the ball in the gutter gets you a zero. Now the kiddie's  
self-esteem is helped by changing the rules of the game to a "can't lose"  
configuration.

leave age out of the equation. some 12 year olds are really bright and some  
80 year olds still don't know what goes on behind a light switch.

bill wb9ivr

-----

Date: Mon, 27 Dec 1993 19:56:59 GMT  
From: usc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!cass.ma02.bull.com!petra!zds-  
oem!news@network.ucsd.edu (Earl Morse)  
Subject: License Restructure - Do we really need it?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Dec23.025442.3559@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev.  
Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>From: (Earl Morse)

>

>> It seems refreshing in these days of "I want it and it better be easy"  
>> to actually have a system that rewards additional effort with more  
>> privileges as the current licensing structure does.

>

>A 85/100 theory examination covering all current question pools is

>hardly making it easy. In fact, it makes the entry-level license  
>somewhat harder to obtain than today's no-code tech license.

Any test that was comprised of questions from a pool would be easy. Especially  
a published pool.

>  
>  
>> If a person desires an entry level, vhf only, or hf phone privilege  
>> license the current system accommodates them.  
>  
>Right. With a complex set of frequency allocations and other  
>restrictions which are useless.

So what if it is complex? You need to memorize it for the test anyway. Oops, I  
forgot, you only need to memorize the question and answer. You do not need to  
understand why.

>  
>  
>> The proposal of two license classes is  
>> ludicrous. Basically separated by a code requirement, because theory  
>> exams are ridiculously too easy these days, it probably wouldn't be long  
>> before everyone had a Class A license.  
>  
>So what? If the point is to get more people interested in ham radio,  
>isn't it better to make the licensing system streamlined with fewer  
>license classes and less bigoted, elitist assholes such as yourself  
>who think they're better than everyone else "just because" you happen  
>to have passed a code exam. Oh boy, I'm impressed.

I'm sorry I struck your code nerve. I didn't mean to do that, but that doesn't  
mean I'm an elitest a\*\*hole because I was able to pass the test.

>  
>  
>> Imagine the anarchy that this  
>> would cause on the HF phone bands.  
>  
>DANGER WILL ROBINSON! IMMINENT DEATH OF HAM RADIO PREDICTED!

DON'T SHOUT! It won't be the end. It might drive away all the decent folks  
and leave the anti-code bigots like yourself.

>  
>> Not that CW isn't used, but the major  
>> influx of new hams would definitely be on the phone bands, because those  
>> that can do code are already doing it.  
>  
>Class B privs only include 10meter phone, along with existing

>novice CW subbands, which, obviously, you can't use unless you know  
>code. So explain how this influx of new hams would be on the phone  
>bands, please.

Since you said please: Dropping the code speed to 10 WPM is almost a 25 percent decrease in speed. Look how many people have general class tickets at 13 WPM. At 10 WPM you can expect even more, especially with the current VE code tests. Where you take the exam over and over until you get lucky and answer 7 questions. No knowledge of code needed. And of course the theory test won't be difficult since it comes from a pool.

>  
>> Then what is everybody going to  
>> want? More SSB frequencies? Then they will be attacking CW/DATA bandwidth.  
>> Wanting to convert it to SSB spectrum.  
>  
>Majority rule. Its what makes the US a great place to live. I take it  
>you'd like a dictatorship, Ed?

Who's Ed? Name here is Earl, Rev. Hate to break it to you, but you are not a majority. Internet hams are a very small minority. Also your majority will not take place unless the FCC accepts your petition and issues a NPRM, to which I will be happy to comment.

>  
>  
>> I already dislike the thought of losing privileges. Sure you say nobody will  
>> lose privileges, but what about the bottom 25 kHz and the Extra phone bands.  
>  
>Nobody takes those away from you. Now you simply have to share with the  
>other people who have earned the right to be there.

I will simply have to share them with people who were given the right as a gift. Not yet anyway.

>  
>  
>> After this new license plan I won't be able to enjoy the "privilege" of a CW  
>> portion that is a little quieter where I can assume everyone at least knows  
>> 20 wpm and proper cw operating procedures.  
>  
>Oh, please Ed. I routinely listen to some of these exclusive "extra" bands  
>and I hear people sending at 13wpm and slower speeds all the time. All  
>the fact that someone passed their 20wpm code test tells you is exactly  
>that - they passed it. It doesn't tell you if they can actually send or  
>receive that fast, they could have simply guessed right enough times.

>I know many people at local VE sessions who have done exactly that -  
>guessed, and are now extras.

Oh please Rev., my name is Earl. Read the signature again if you forget. So what if they go slower. Maybe his keyer was broken, besides how many do you hear going faster. They may have guessed right on their exams, but then they wouldn't be in the CW bands anyway. I have been wanting to see the CW testing revamped anyway.

>  
>

>> I passed the 20 WPM test because it was a challenge. I found out I liked  
>> Morse and I have preferred it to other modes since then. Getting the Extra  
>> class was a feeling of accomplishment (at the time) and I feel I deserve to  
>> feel a little elitest.

>

>Well, fine Ed, you can feel elitist all you want. Do you only talk to  
>other people with 1x2 callsigns? What a real prize to the amateur radio  
>community you must be. I bet all those extra-class hams you've  
>"elmered" really know alot, huh?

OBJECTION! Rev. Michael has no knowledge of my activities. He doesn't know that I teach ham classes, that a big hunk of new licensees see my signature on their CSCE's, and that I have elmered many new hams. Some from no code to advanced and extra. I talk to anyone and I am sure the local ham community would miss me. Including the 2m and 440 repeaters that I work on. Talk about something you know, Michael.

>  
>

>> However, under this new plan, I can apply to the ARRL  
>> and get a code proficiency certificate. Big deal I can do that now and still  
>> have my CW bands. Who needs bragging rights?

>

>You'll still have your CW bands, so what's the problem. Oh, you'll  
>have to SHARE them. Golly, I didn't realize the FCC was granting you  
>your own personal spectrum allocation when they gave you your  
>license. Do you have a frequency deed to share with the rest of us?

>

I would love to share the bandwidth with anybody who earned it.

>

>> The more of this crap I see posted here makes me sicker by the day. I was  
>> in favor of a license that allowed people to become introduced to the hobby.

>

>Well, you know Ed, USENET is like a radio. There's an OFF switch.

Believe me, I use it. Purge All works good too. Who's Ed?

>  
>  
>> Now I  
>> hear that this license isn't enough and we have to make HF privileges  
>> available.  
>  
>I'm not in favor of giving no-clues access to HF spectrum. Nothing  
>churns my stomach more than listening to a CB-transplant whine for  
>HF access.

At last, some thing we agree on.

>  
>However, those facts do not mitigate other facts. One, that the  
>existing licensing system with 6 levels of licenses is just plain  
>stupid, and created a bureaucratic nightmare. Sometimes to upgrade  
>from "Tech" to "Extra" takes 6 to 8 months for your paperwork to get  
>processed.

When the FCC goes to a better computer system they should be able to support any number of license levels. You mean you would want to change a whole system just so that you can get your license a few weeks faster.

>  
>  
>> Then we will have to make more SSB spectrum available too, I suppose.  
>  
>If that's eventually what the majority of hams want, Ed, do you have  
>a problem with that? You do understand the concept of a democracy and  
>majority rule, don't you?

Your views do not represent the majority. If they do then I guess I will have to live with it. Maybe I should stop working on the VE teams so that I can keep the "gimme gimmes" in the minority.

>  
>  
>> However you cook it up, it still sounds like people want something for  
>> nothing.  
>  
>Clearly, you've never even read one of MY postings, have you? These  
>liberal types in this group will tell you that I'm about the closest  
>thing to Pat Buchanan in this newsgroup, and when \*I\* can see the  
>sensibility of something like this, it must be a good idea.

I've seen your postings. Easily the bitchiest of the group. You seem to

have only one nerve and everybody is standing on it.

>

>

>> It also seems to be a toe hold for a codeless HF license. 10 WPM is almost  
>> codeless anyway. I guess if people can't hack it we have to lower the  
>> standard.

>

>You, Ed, sound like a tired old geezer driving around in a geeze-mobile  
>with an oxygen tank, afraid that your precious CW spectrum will be over-  
>run by a bunch of "non-hams" who don't do code at at least 35wpm. God  
>forbid someone should lower the code proficiency from 20wpm to 10wpm.  
>Gasp! The bands will be flooded with CBers!

I'm 30 years old, don't have an oxygen tank, and what's a geezemobile? I don't  
think I have one. Unless it is one of those hamfest aisle blocking carts, which  
I don't have either.

>

>> Afterall isn't that how America became great?

>

>No, we became great by adapting and learning from past history. CW is  
>a part of radio history, but maintaining radio history isn't a goal of  
>Part 97. I support CW for HF access simply because it is a treaty  
>issue, but I also understand that in the evolving world of amateur  
>radio within the United States there should be less of an emphasis on  
>an antiquated mode of communication. If the ITU treaty were not in  
>effect, I would probably say eliminate it altogether, as long as we  
>could replace it with something else, like more difficult theory  
>exams.

Adapting and learning from history is only part of it. Working hard  
and being rewarded for extra effort is the real reason.

>

>

>> Do the work and get there like everyone else who made it did. If  
>> you can't do the work then be content with the license you have.

>

>I'd rather jump on the Clinton liberal "gimme gimme" welfare-state  
>mentality bandwagon. Its easier.

You're getting so far right I can see you out of my left eye.

>

>> Apparently these will be  
>> the people who want the restructuring, led by a few renegade higher licensees.

>

>I'm an advanced class, and I could give a fly's ass about the extra

>25kc's of bandwidth. The only people that I know who have complained  
>about my proposal are a bunch of extras who are whining about loss of  
>their "exclusive" spectrum.

You don't need to give a fly's ass, you would get that bandwidth for free  
under your proposal.

If you want to change the code speed make the general class 10 WPM, but keep a  
license structure that does reward for extra effort. I hate to see anything lower  
the standards to make it available for more people.

Earl Morse  
KZ8E  
e.morse@zds.com

-----  
Date: Mon, 27 Dec 1993 15:42:55 GMT  
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!  
gary@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2facfk\$41dr@bigblue.oit.unc.edu>,  
<1993Dec23.175555.23762@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <2flupe\$ca0@bigblue.oit.unc.edu>  
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <2flupe\$ca0@bigblue.oit.unc.edu> cheech@med.unc.edu (Greg Young)  
writes:

>  
>This is much like I imagine a class C license exam would look, heavy  
>emphasis on basic safety and operating rules with simple radio theory  
>included as necessary to allow operation within those rules. It may be  
>that we have different definitions of simple radio theory.

Well you start with Maxwell's equations, and everything else is simply  
derived from there. :-)

Gary

--  
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary  
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary  
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary  
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

-----

Date: Mon, 27 Dec 1993 15:31:46 GMT  
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!  
gary@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <931222.06000.EDELLERS@delphi.com>,  
<1993Dec26.191853.7323@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <CInxHq.Jz1@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>  
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <CInxHq.Jz1@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> rcoyle@NeoSoft.com (Robert Coyle) writes:

>In article <1993Dec26.191853.7323@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>> Digging holes and filling them back in again requires EFFORT too Robert,  
>> but what may be suitable for the punishment barracks at Leavenworth isn't  
>> necessarily a suitable use of time for radio amateur candidates. There's  
>> a world of difference between \*productive\* effort, like learning useful  
>> theory and regulatory matters that have application for all RF modes, and  
>> mere hazing by the spark brigade.

>

>Hazing? Now come on, Gary, you can't be serious! It's not called hazing,  
>it's called LEARNING. CW is in wide use on the HF bands, and FCC has set  
>aside portions of each band for that mode, and those who are serious  
>should either learn it, abide by the licensing regulations as set forth by  
>Part 97, or go out and find another hobby where they don't have to  
>demonstrate effort. As for "learning useful theory and regulatory  
>matters," memorizing a question pool demonstrates little, other than  
>knowing which questions go with which answers. I challenge you to show me  
>who this is "advancing the state of the radio art," as defined by 97.1.

Robert, a little learning might do you some good. The FCC has \*not\*  
set aside portions of each band for CW usage. In fact, the \*only\*  
frequencies that are set aside exclusively for CW operation are  
50.0-50.1 and 144.0-144.1, and guess what, \*you don't have to pass  
a Morse test to use them\*. All the other non-voice/image segments are  
digital mode subbands. CW is, of course, allowed on \*any\* amateur  
frequency, though it's hardly used on any frequency where better  
modes, such as SSB or FM, are allowed.

And I still maintain that your claim that memorizing a question pool  
demonstrates little can equally be said about memorizing 26 alphabetic  
encodings. I challenge \*you\* to show how this is "advancing the state  
of the radio art" since CW usage is now obsolete in every major radio  
service except for some amateurs', and a few cheap shipowners', radio  
rooms.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: 28 Dec 1993 05:14:32 GMT

From: swrinde!emory!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!concert!bigblue.oit.unc.edu!  
cheech@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec23.175555.23762@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<2flupe\$ca0@bigblue.oit.unc.edu>, <1993Dec27.154255.10935@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject : Re: License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <1993Dec27.154255.10935@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:  
>In article <2flupe\$ca0@bigblue.oit.unc.edu> cheech@med.unc.edu (Greg Young)  
writes:

>>

>>It may be

>>that we have different definitions of simple radio theory.

>

>Well you start with Maxwell's equations, and everything else is simply  
>derived from there. :-)

And the derivation will be left to the student as an exercise. :-)

Greg Young AC4YT  
cheech@med.unc.edu

-----

Date: Tue, 28 Dec 1993 07:24:41 GMT

From: pacbell.com!unet!loren!larson@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec26.191853.7323@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<CInxHq.Jz1@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <1993Dec27.153146.10635@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <1993Dec27.153146.10635@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary  
Coffman) writes:

> CW is, of course, allowed on \*any\* amateur  
> frequency, though it's hardly used on any frequency where better  
> modes, such as SSB or FM, are allowed.

Last time this subject came up on the net, it was the phone and other mode ops complaining about the CW ops being so discourteous to operate in the phone portions of the bands.

Yes, Gary, the main reason is courtesy.

Alan

-----  
Date: Mon, 27 Dec 1993 15:40:20 GMT  
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!  
gary@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec23.164509.18969@anomaly.sbs.com>,  
<1993Dec23.183522.24056@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <2flt6v\$amf@bigblue.oit.unc.edu>  
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <2flt6v\$amf@bigblue.oit.unc.edu> cheech@med.unc.edu (Greg Young) writes:

>  
> Maybe we have different ideas on what the class A/B exam will be like. I  
> had imagined something more along the lines of the advanced exam, where I  
> actually had to think a little.

Yeah, that's the idea. Even kids can think a little if they're challenged to do so. The written exam, as a first cut, would simply be all the current pools combined. None of that requires math above simple algebra, or more than basic knowledge of electrodynamics. That should be accessible to any bright 6th grade science student. And it certainly should be accessible to any high school student. There's nothing in the exams that requires college level knowledge (unless the level of college students has dropped much further than in my day). I don't expect functional illiterates to be able to pass the exams.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #552

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*